

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

BEFORE THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
AND APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
TO THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: APRIL 29, 2019
12 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR
CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2019-08

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION:	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS (CLIN 1,2 OR 3).	5
CLOSED SESSION	NONE
4. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM "3" ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).	
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.	36
6. ADJOURNMENT.	38

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MONDAY, APRIL 29, 2019

12:00 P.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WELCOME, EVERYBODY, TO
THE APRIL MEETING OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS'
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND APPLICATION REVIEW
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CIRM. LIKE TO CALL THE MEETING TO
ORDER. PROCEED TO ROLL CALL. MARIA.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

DR. DULIEGE: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

DR. HIGGINS: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

DR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: SHERRY LANSING. DAVE
MARTIN.

DR. MARTIN: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER.

MS. MILLER: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.

DR. PADILLA: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.

MR. PANETTA: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

DR. PRIETO: HERE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
2 DR. QUINT: HERE.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
4 MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
6 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
8 DR. STEWARD: HERE.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
12 MR. TORRES: HERE.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
14 MS. WINOKUR: HERE.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: ARE THERE ANY OTHER BOARD
16 MEMBERS ON THE LINE WHOSE NAME I DID NOT CALL?
17 DR. ZIEDONIS: YES. DOUG ZIEDONIS,
18 Z-I-E-D-O-N-I-S.
19 DR. SANDMEYER: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: IS THAT ALL? OKAY. I
21 THINK WE ARE READY TO START. WE HAVE A QUORUM.
22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. I'D
23 LIKE TO GO IMMEDIATELY TO ITEM 3, CONSIDERATION OF
24 APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL
25 STAGE PROJECTS CLIN1, 2, OR 3. TURN THE MEETING AT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THIS POINT OVER TO MR. SHEEHY.

2 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS.
3 DR. SAMBRANO, ARE YOU TAKING US THROUGH THIS TODAY
4 OR IS DR. PATEL?

5 DR. SAMBRANO: I AM.

6 MR. SHEEHY: THANKS, GIL. IF YOU'D LIKE
7 TO GO AHEAD WITH THE PRESENTATION.

8 DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. THANK YOU, MR.
9 SHEEHY.

10 SO GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE, OR ALMOST
11 AFTERNOON. TODAY WE ARE BRINGING FOR YOUR
12 CONSIDERATION THREE APPLICATIONS FROM OUR LAST
13 CLINICAL REVIEW. WE HAVE ONE APPLICATION THAT'S
14 RESPONDING TO THE CLIN1, WHICH IS TO FUND LATE STAGE
15 PRECLINICAL WORK, AND TWO APPLICATIONS FOR CLIN2,
16 WHICH FUNDS CLINICAL TRIALS.

17 A VERY QUICK REMINDER OF THE SCORING
18 SYSTEM THAT IS USED. ALL APPLICATIONS ARE SCORED ON
19 A SYSTEM OF 1, 2, OR 3, WITH 1 BEING THOSE THAT
20 RECEIVED EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANT FUNDING.
21 THOSE THAT GET A SCORE OF 2 USUALLY ARE PROMISING,
22 BUT NEED IMPROVEMENT, AND THOSE GIVE THE APPLICANT
23 THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO BACK TO THE GRANTS WORKING
24 GROUP TO ADDRESS THOSE; AND A SCORE OF 3, THOSE THAT
25 ARE SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT DON'T COME BACK FOR SIX

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MONTHS.

2 SO WE HAVE THREE APPLICATIONS. ONE OF THE
3 APPLICATIONS FALLS UNDER OUR SICKLE CELL DISEASE
4 CLINICAL PROGRAM. AND SO AS YOU MAY RECALL, AT THE
5 ONSET OF THIS YEAR, WE SPLIT THE BUDGET ALLOCATION
6 BETWEEN OUR SICKLE CELL PROGRAMS AND OTHER. AND SO
7 I'M GOING TO GO FIRST OVER THE SICKLE CELL PROGRAM
8 AND THAT APPLICATION, AND THEN I'LL SUBSEQUENTLY
9 PRESENT THE BUDGET AND APPLICATIONS FOR THE
10 NON-SICKLE CELL.

11 UNDER THE SICKLE CELL DISEASE PROGRAM,
12 THIS IS THE FIRST ONE TO BE CONSIDERED, AND WE
13 ALLOCATED \$30 MILLION FOR THAT. THE AMOUNT THAT'S
14 REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANT IS 4.5 MILLION. IF YOU
15 WERE TO APPROVE THIS, WE WOULD COMMIT THIS AMOUNT
16 AND LEAVE 25.5 MILLION IN THAT BUCKET. HOWEVER,
17 BECAUSE THIS IS A PROGRAM IN COLLABORATION WITH THE
18 NHLBI, OUR EXPECTATION IS THAT NHLBI WILL BE
19 CO-FUNDING THIS PROJECT WITH US. RIGHT NOW THEY ARE
20 IN THEIR FINAL FUNDING CONSIDERATION FOR THIS
21 PROGRAM. SO WE DON'T HAVE A FINAL-FINAL WORD, BUT
22 THEY HAVE LOOKED AT THIS APPLICATION FAVORABLY. SO
23 WE EXPECT THAT IT WILL COME. SO IT WILL, UNDER THAT
24 EXPECTATION, REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF COMMITMENT FROM
25 CIRM POSSIBLY TO 50 PERCENT OF 4.5.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO THAT'S BUDGET OVERALL. IN TERMS OF
2 TARGET NUMBERS FOR THE SICKLE CELL PROGRAM, WE ARE
3 TARGETING FOR THIS YEAR FOUR CLINICAL TRIALS AND ONE
4 CLIN1. THIS IS A CLIN1, SO WOULD MEET THE TARGET
5 FOR THIS YEAR FOR CLIN1 PROGRAMS UNDER SICKLE CELL.

6 SO A SUMMARY OF THIS PROPOSAL. THIS IS
7 CLIN1-1497. AND THE THERAPY IS AN AUTOLOGOUS
8 CHRISPR-EDITED HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL THERAPY FOR
9 PATIENTS WITH SICKLE CELL DISEASE. THE GOAL IS TO
10 COMPLETE IND-ENABLING WORK AND TO FILE AN IND. AND
11 THE TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED IS 4.5 MILLION.

12 A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ON THE DISEASE
13 INDICATION AND THE VALUE PROPOSITION. SO AS MANY OF
14 YOU KNOW, SICKLE CELL DISEASE AFFECTS ABOUT A
15 HUNDRED THOUSAND AMERICANS. IT IS MOST COMMON IN
16 SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN ANCESTRY INDIVIDUALS, SO
17 AFFECTING ABOUT ONE IN 365 BIRTHS, AND GLOBALLY
18 ABOUT 300,000 ARE BORN WITH SICKLE CELL DISEASE
19 EVERY YEAR.

20 THE VALUE PROPOSITION OF THIS THERAPY IS
21 THAT THE ONLY AVAILABLE CURE CURRENTLY IS AN
22 ALLOGENEIC HSC TRANSPLANTATION, WHICH CAN BE
23 DIFFICULT FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS IN TERMS OF
24 HAVING THE RIGHT DONOR. AND SO THE AVAILABILITY OF
25 DONORS IS DIFFICULT TO GET, GRAFT VERSUS HOST

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DISEASE, GRAFT FAILURE. ALL OF THESE THINGS MAKE IT
2 MUCH MORE DIFFICULT AND COMPLEX. THIS IS AN
3 AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY WHICH WOULD TAKE THE PATIENT'S
4 OWN HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS AND WOULD OBTAIN MANY
5 OF THESE LIMITATIONS. SO CERTAINLY WOULD BROADEN
6 THE PATIENTS THAT THIS COULD REACH AS WELL.

7 SO WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL PROJECT? THIS
8 THERAPY INCLUDES GENETICALLY MODIFIED HEMATOPOIETIC
9 STEM CELLS. SO THAT'S WHY IT QUALIFIES FOR CIRM
10 FUNDING.

11 THIS NEXT SLIDE SHOWS YOU WHERE THE
12 PROJECT FITS INTO OUR OVERALL PORTFOLIO. CIRM IS
13 FUNDING SEVERAL PROJECTS IN SICKLE CELL DISEASE.
14 TWO OF THEM ARE CLINICAL TRIALS, BUT THEY HAVE
15 DIFFERENT APPROACHES. ONE USES A LENTIVIRAL VECTOR
16 TO TRANSFER AN ANTI-SICKLING GENE. ANOTHER ONE IS
17 WORKING ON ADVANCING A PROTOCOL THAT ALLOWS FOR
18 IMMUNE TOLERANCE THROUGH MIXED CHIMERISM THAT WOULD
19 IMPROVE THE TRANSPLANT OF THE -- ALLOGENEIC
20 TRANSPLANT FOR PATIENTS.

21 AND THEN WE HAVE ANOTHER APPROACH THAT'S
22 ALSO IN A CLINICAL TRIAL THAT USES CRISPR EDITING SIMILAR TO
23 THIS CURRENT PROPOSAL, BUT THE BIG DIFFERENCE IS
24 THAT THE CURRENT PROPOSAL USES A VIRUS-FREE CRISPR
25 EDITING TECHNOLOGY THAT MAY HAVE SOME ADVANTAGES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IN TERMS OF PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING, SO THIS
2 APPLICANT HAS HAD A TRAN¹, SO A TRANSLATION STAGE
3 PROGRAM, THAT HAS BROUGHT THEM NOW TO THE STAGE
4 WHERE THEY CAN DO IND-ENABLING WORK. THAT AWARD WAS
5 ABOUT 4.5 MILLION. THEY WERE ON TRACK AND ACHIEVED
6 MILESTONES PRETTY MUCH ALL THE WAY THROUGH IN THAT
7 PREVIOUS AWARD.

8 SO THE GWG REVIEWED THIS APPLICATION, GAVE
9 IT A SCORE OF 1 WITH 14 MEMBERS GIVING A SCORE OF 1
10 AND (INAUDIBLE) SCORE OF 2. AND SO THE CIRM TEAM
11 RECOMMENDS THIS FOR THE FUNDING IN THE AMOUNT OF 4.5
12 MILLION. MR. SHEEHY.

13 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO.

14 DO I HAVE A MOTION TO EITHER ACCEPT THE
15 TEAM RECOMMENDATION OR TO NOT ACCEPT THE
16 RECOMMENDATION AND EITHER TO FUND OR NOT FUND THIS
17 APPLICATION?

18 MR. TORRES: MOTION TO ACCEPT AND FUND THE
19 APPLICATION.

20 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, SENATOR TORRES.
21 DO I HAVE A SECOND?

22 DR. DULIEGE: I SECOND.

23 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. DULIEGE.

24 IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION BY BOARD MEMBERS
25 ABOUT THIS APPLICATION?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. MARTIN: CAN YOU REVEAL TO US WHAT THE
2 PROCESS IS FOR THE NONVIRAL TRANSDUCTION SYSTEM?

3 DR. SAMBRANO: THEY DO A DIRECT
4 CRISPR-CAS9 ON THE CELLS. SO THEY JUST AVOID HAVING
5 TO DO A SELECTION PROCESS THROUGH WHICH THEY WOULD
6 DO IF THEY USE A VIRAL VECTOR. SO THEY'RE JUST
7 BASICALLY DOING IT DIRECTLY ON THE CELL.

8 DR. MARTIN: A VECTOR OPERATION?

9 DR. SAMBRANO: YES.

10 DR. MARTIN: IT'S JUST NAKED DNA? THE
11 REASON I'M ASKING IS BECAUSE THERE IS SOME
12 TECHNOLOGY THAT IS FARTHER ALONG THAN JUST NAKED
13 DNA. AND I JUST WONDER WHETHER THAT'S BEEN
14 CONSIDERED BY THE APPLICANT.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: I DON'T WANT TO GO INTO TOO
16 MUCH DETAIL ABOUT THEIR SYSTEM. IF THE APPLICANT
17 WERE HERE, THAT WOULD BE UP TO THEM IF THEY WANT TO
18 GO INTO THAT LEVEL OF DETAIL. IF YOU FEEL IT'S
19 IMPORTANT, WE CAN DO THAT.

20 DR. MARTIN: IT'S MORE CURIOSITY AND
21 BUILDING MORE CONFIDENCE. IT LOOKS GOOD. I'M NOT
22 OBJECTING TO IT. I'M JUST CURIOUS AS TO WHETHER WE
23 CAN REALLY EXPECT THIS TO BE ANOTHER BREAKTHROUGH.

24 MR. SHEEHY: ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL
25 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DR. DULIEGE: NOPE. PRETTY
STRAIGHTFORWARD APPLICATION.
MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT
AT ANY OF THE SITES?
MS. BONNEVILLE: WE DON'T HAVE ANY HERE.
MR. SHEEHY: GREAT. THANK YOU.
THEN LET'S CALL THE ROLL AND PROCEED TO A
VOTE PLEASE.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
DR. DULIEGE: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
DR. HIGGINS: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
DR. MARTIN: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER.
MS. MILLER: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
DR. PADILLA: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
MR. PANETTA: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
DR. PRIETO: AYE.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. QUINT: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
3 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
5 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
7 DR. STEWARD: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
11 MR. TORRES: AYE.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
13 MS. WINOKUR: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
15 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU.
16 I THINK IT'S BACK TO YOU, DR. SAMBRANO, TO
17 DISCUSS THE NEXT APPLICATION PLEASE.
18 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. SHEEHY.
19 SO NOW LOOKING AT THE BUDGET FOR CLIN2
20 APPLICATIONS AND WHERE THEY SIT. SO WE HAD AN
21 ANNUAL ALLOCATION OF 93 MILLION FOR NON-SICKLE CELL
22 PROGRAMS. THERE'S BEEN 25.7 THAT HAS BEEN COMMITTED
23 THUS FAR. IF YOU TODAY APPROVE THE TWO APPLICATIONS
24 UNDER CONSIDERATION, WE WOULD ADD 11.3 MILLION,
25 LEAVING US WITH 57 MILLION IN THAT POT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF AWARDS THAT WE
2 ARE TARGETING, THIS WOULD ADD TWO CLINICAL TRIALS,
3 MAKING IT A TOTAL OF FOUR OUT OF EIGHT THAT WE ARE
4 TARGETING.

5 SO THE FIRST PROJECT UNDER CONSIDERATION
6 IS CLIN2-11480, AND THIS IS AN AUTOLOGOUS CD18
7 GENE-MODIFIED HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL THERAPY FOR
8 PATIENTS WITH LEUKOCYTE ADHESION DEFICIENCY 1. THE
9 GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1/2 TRIAL, AND THEY ARE
10 ASKING FOR 6.6 MILLION IN FUNDING AND PROVIDING 5.6
11 IN CO-FUNDING.

12 SOME BACKGROUND ON THIS CLINICAL
13 INDICATION. SO THE LEUKOCYTE ADHESION DEFICIENCY 1
14 IS A RARE AUTOSOMAL RECESSIVE DISORDER THAT OCCURS
15 ABOUT ONE IN A MILLION PEOPLE NATIONWIDE. AND IT IS
16 AN IMMUNE DEFICIENCY, AND MOST CHILDREN WITH THE
17 SEVERE FORM WILL DIE FROM INFECTIONS BEFORE THE AGE
18 OF TWO.

19 SO THE VALUE PROPOSITION THAT THIS OFFERS,
20 THE ONLY CURRENT CURE IS AN ALLOGENEIC HSC
21 TRANSPLANT, SO SIMILAR TO THE SICKLE CELL. THERE
22 ARE THOSE LIMITATIONS THAT COME WITH AN ALLOGENEIC
23 TRANSPLANT, INCLUDING TRYING TO FIND APPROPRIATE
24 DONORS AND SO FORTH. THIS WOULD BE A GENE
25 CORRECTION GENE THERAPY THAT WOULD RESTORE IMMUNE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUNCTION AND CERTAINLY WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT IS
2 NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE TODAY.

3 WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL PROJECT? THERAPY
4 INCLUDES GENETICALLY MODIFIED HEMATOPOIETIC STEM
5 CELLS.

6 FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT, WE REALLY
7 DON'T HAVE ANY OTHER PROJECTS IN THIS INDICATION.
8 WE HAVE SOME THAT ARE RELATED IN TERMS OF THE TYPE
9 OF APPROACH, BUT NOTHING IN THIS CLINICAL ARENA.

10 IN TERMS OF PREVIOUS FUNDING, THE
11 APPLICANT HAS NOT HAD PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING. SO
12 THAT TAKES US TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW
13 SUMMARY. THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP UNANIMOUSLY
14 RECOMMENDED THIS APPLICATION WITH A SCORE OF 1. AND
15 CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDS FUNDING IN THE AWARD AMOUNT OF
16 6.6 MILLION.

17 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO.

18 SO DO I HAVE A MOTION TO EITHER ACCEPT THE
19 TEAM'S RECOMMENDATION AND FUND THIS PROJECT OR TO
20 NOT ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION AND NOT TO FUND IT?

21 DR. PRIETO: MOVE TO FUND.

22 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. PRIETO.

23 DO I HAVE A SECOND?

24 MR. ROWLETT: SECOND.

25 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, AL.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OKAY. DO WE HAVE ANY BOARD COMMENTS OR
2 QUESTIONS?

3 MR. TORRES: YES. JUST ONE QUESTION. WHY
4 WAS IT TAKEN OUT OF ORDER? WAS THERE A REASON FOR
5 THAT? THE NEXT ONE, AT LEAST ON THE AGENDA, SHOWS
6 11380. YOU JUST DID IT ON YOUR OWN?

7 DR. SAMBRANO: I DID IT ALL ON MY OWN.

8 MR. TORRES: I WAS WONDERING IF THERE WAS
9 A SUBSTANTIVE REASON.

10 DR. SAMBRANO: NO.

11 MR. SHEEHY: OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

12 DR. MARTIN: THERE'S AN APPARENT ISSUE
13 HERE THAT IS OBVIOUSLY TROUBLING TO RAISE OR TO
14 IGNORE, AND THAT IS THIS IS A VERY RARE DISEASE.
15 AND WITH WHAT I ANTICIPATE, ANYWAY, BEING SOMEWHAT
16 LIMITED FUNDING FOR THE REST OF THIS PARTICULAR
17 ENTIRE PROGRAM. I WONDER ABOUT JUST HOW SHOULD WE
18 DEAL WITH THIS? MAYBE IT WILL WORK; MAYBE IT WON'T,
19 AND WE HAVEN'T DONE THIS ONE BEFORE.

20 THE OTHER THING IS, AS A FORMER MEDICAL
21 GENETICIST, WHAT ONE ALWAYS THINKS ABOUT IS THE
22 DISEASE BURDEN. AND THIS MAY SOUND INHUMANE, BUT
23 THIS IS A RELATIVELY LOW BURDEN DISEASE. LOW BURDEN
24 IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS IS NOT A LIFELONG BURDEN FOR
25 50 YEARS OR 30 YEARS OR SOMETHING OF THAT SORT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IT'S RELATIVELY SHORT BECAUSE THESE CHILDREN DO DIE
2 IF THEY DON'T HAVE SOME TYPE OF A MATCH FOR HSC.

3 I JUST -- IT'S TROUBLING, AS I SAID, TO
4 BRING IT UP OR TO IGNORE IT. I JUST WONDER WHAT THE
5 THOUGHTS ARE OF OTHER BOARD MEMBERS ON THIS.

6 MR. SHEEHY: PERHAPS DR. SAMBRANO COULD
7 ADD SOME CONTEXT ABOUT THE APPLICANT. IT IS AN
8 INDUSTRY APPLICANT WITH A COMMERCIALIZATION PLAN. I
9 DO THINK THAT PUTS IT IN A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT
10 CONTEXT THAN AN ACADEMIC RESEARCH EXERCISE THAT
11 WOULDN'T NECESSARILY LEAD TO OTHER PROJECTS,
12 INDICATIONS, OR TO A SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS MODEL THAT
13 WOULD CONTINUE TO PRODUCE THESE CURES FOR THESE
14 INDIVIDUALS ON INTO THE FUTURE.

15 DR. SAMBRANO: I'M NOT SURE WHAT I CAN ADD
16 TO WHAT MR. SHEEHY JUST SAID OTHER THAN, YES, THEY
17 ARE DEFINITELY A FOR-PROFIT COMPANY, HAVE A PLAN FOR
18 DEVELOPMENT. AND SO TO THE EXTENT THAT THAT IS A
19 CONSIDERATION, THAT IS ABSOLUTELY THE CASE.

20 MR. SHEEHY: DO OTHER MEMBERS HAVE ANY
21 THOUGHTS ON THIS? OKAY.

22 DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT FROM ANY OF
23 THE SITES?

24 DR. DULIEGE: ONE QUESTION FROM
25 ANNE-MARIE. IT SAYS IT'S A PHASE 2 TRIAL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COMPLETION. MAYBE CAN WE GET A LITTLE BIT OF UPDATE
2 ON THE PHASE 2 TRIAL INITIATION? IS IT GOING ON
3 TARGET? AND WHAT'S THE COMPLETION? I UNDERSTAND
4 THAT THE FUNDING IS ABOUT \$6.6 MILLION. IF WE CAN
5 GET A LITTLE BIT MORE EXPLANATION ABOUT THE
6 COMPLETION.

7 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE APPLICATION WOULD
8 ACTUALLY FUND WHAT THEY'RE CALLING A PHASE 1/2
9 TRIAL. SO THEY HAVE NOT YET STARTED WITH ANY
10 PATIENTS. THEY WOULD HAVE TWO COHORTS. THEY WOULD
11 START WITH -- IN TOTAL IT'S GOING TO BE A VERY SMALL
12 NUMBER OF PATIENTS BECAUSE OF THE RARITY OF THE
13 DISEASE. BUT THEY WOULD START WITH A COUPLE OF
14 PATIENTS IN ORDER TO ENSURE SAFETY AND THEN WOULD GO
15 ON TO THE PHASE 2 COHORT FROM THERE IN ORDER TO
16 ASSESS EFFICACY. AND THE TOTAL NUMBER IS UNDER TEN.
17 SO OUR FUNDING WOULD INITIATE THE TRIAL.

18 DR. SCHWARTZ: GOOD MORNING, GOOD
19 AFTERNOON. THIS IS DR. JONATHAN SCHWARTZ. I'M THE
20 CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF ROCKET PHARMA, WHICH IS THE
21 SPONSOR OF THE INITIATIVE.

22 I JUST WANTED TO EMPHASIZE THAT, ALTHOUGH
23 LEUKOCYTE ADHESION DEFICIENCY 1 IS A VERY RARE
24 DISORDER, IT IS NONETHELESS ONE OF THE MOST SEVERE
25 IMMUNODEFICIENCIES THAT IS KNOWN, AS THE DISCUSSION

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HAS INDICATED. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO EMPHASIZE
2 THAT THIS FALLS WITHIN A SPECTRUM OF
3 NEUTROPHIL-MEDIATED IMMUNODEFICIENCIES.

4 THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND GLOBAL
5 STUDY LEAD FOR THIS INITIATIVE, DR. DONALD KOHN AT
6 UCLA, IS ALSO THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR ON ANOTHER
7 IMMUNODEFICIENCY DISORDER THAT AFFECTS LEUKOCYTES,
8 SPECIFICALLY NEUTROPHILS. IT'S A CHRONIC
9 GRANULOMATOUS DISEASE STUDY WHICH IS UNDER WAY AND
10 IS APPEARING TO BE QUITE SUCCESSFUL AS PRELIMINARY
11 DATA HAVE BEEN PRESENTED OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS.

12 THIS STUDY, IN FACT, UTILIZES A VECTOR
13 THAT MAKES USE OF AN IDENTICAL VIRAL PROMOTER. AND,
14 THEREFORE, WE HAVE A REASONABLE DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE
15 THAT THIS HAS A GOOD PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS.

16 I WOULD ALSO EMPHASIZE THAT ROCKET PHARMA
17 AND OUR ACADEMIC PARTNERS HAVE FDA BUY-IN THAT,
18 BECAUSE OF THE DISORDER'S RARITY AND EXTREME
19 SEVERITY, THAT THIS MODESTLY SIZED STUDY THAT IS
20 APPROXIMATELY TEN PATIENTS WOULD BE SUFFICIENT FOR
21 MARKETING AUTHORIZATION IF THE RESULTS ARE
22 FAVORABLE.

23 SO I THINK, ALTHOUGH IT'S A VERY RARE
24 DISEASE, WE'RE MAKING A VERY EFFICIENT USE OF
25 RESOURCES. AND I THINK, JUST AS AN ADDITIONAL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 POINT, KNOWLEDGE GAINED FROM THIS ENDEAVOR IS LIKELY
2 TO IMPACT OUR ABILITY AS A COLLECTIVE GROUP,
3 ACADEMICS AND INDUSTRY SPONSORS, TO DEVELOP
4 ADDITIONAL GENE THERAPIES FOR OTHER DISORDERS
5 AFFECTING WHITE BLOOD CELLS. SO IF WE ARE
6 SUCCESSFUL HERE, THIS IS LIKELY TO BEGET ADDITIONAL
7 INITIATIVES IN OTHER RARE AND PERHAPS NOT-SO-RARE
8 DISORDERS.

9 ONE ADDITIONAL JUST COMMENT IS THAT THE
10 STUDY IS CURRENTLY OPEN AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
11 LOS ANGELES, AND THE FIRST PATIENT IS SCHEDULED TO
12 BEGIN TREATMENT OVER THE COMING WEEKS.

13 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU. DO WE HAVE ANY
14 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

15 DO WE HAVE ANY MORE PUBLIC COMMENT?

16 COULD WE CALL THE ROLL PLEASE.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

18 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

20 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

22 DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.

24 DR. MARTIN: I'LL ABSTAIN IF I MAY.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. MILLER: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
3 DR. PADILLA: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
5 MR. PANETTA: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
7 DR. PRIETO: AYE.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
9 DR. QUINT: ABSTAIN.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
11 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
13 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
15 DR. STEWARD: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
19 MR. TORRES: ABSTAIN.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
21 MS. WINOKUR: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
23 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU.
24 DR. SAMBRANO, THE NEXT APPLICATION PLEASE.
25 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. SHEEHY.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE NEXT APPLICATION IS CLIN2-11380. AND
2 THIS THERAPY IS AN AUTOLOGOUS GENE-MODIFIED
3 HEMATOPOIETIC STEM AND T-CELL COMBINATION EXPRESSING
4 A T-CELL RECEPTOR THAT RECOGNIZES NY-ESO-1. SO THE
5 INDICATION, THESE WOULD BE PATIENTS WITH SARCOMAS
6 THAT ARE POSITIVE FOR THAT MARKER. AND THEIR GOAL
7 IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1 CLINICAL TRIAL AND ARE
8 REQUESTING \$4.7 MILLION IN FUNDING.

9 SO A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE BACKGROUND. SO
10 SYNOVIAL SARCOMA IS RARE, AFFECTS YOUNG ADULTS, AND
11 THERE ARE ABOUT 8 TO 900 WHO ARE DIAGNOSED WITH THE
12 DISEASE IN THE U.S. EACH YEAR. AND THOSE THAT HAVE
13 LOCAL ADVANCED OR METASTATIC TUMORS HAVE POOR
14 PROGNOSIS AND LOW SURVIVAL.

15 THE VALUE PROPOSITION FOR THIS IS THAT
16 THERE ARE ALSO CERTAINLY NO TREATMENT OPTIONS
17 AVAILABLE TO THESE PATIENTS, ESPECIALLY THOSE THAT
18 HAVE EXHAUSTED SURGERY AND CHEMOTHERAPY. THE
19 PROPOSAL DUAL CELL THERAPY IMPROVES SURVIVAL, AND IT
20 HAS BOTH AN IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON THE TUMOR THROUGH
21 THE ADMINISTRATION OF MATURE T-CELLS THAT ARE
22 TARGETING THE TUMOR, AS WELL AS A MORE SUSTAINED AND
23 MAYBE MORE PERMANENT ANTI-TUMOR THROUGH ENGRAPHMENT
24 OF HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS THAT WOULD THEN GENERATE
25 T-CELLS THAT WOULD ACT ON THE TUMOR.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL PROJECT? THE
2 THERAPY INCLUDES GENETICALLY MODIFIED HEMATOPOIETIC
3 STEM CELLS AS BEFORE.

4 WHERE THIS FITS INTO OUR PORTFOLIO, THERE
5 IS ONE OTHER PROJECT THAT IS BY THE SAME OVERALL
6 TEAM. IT WAS A DISEASE TEAM AWARD THAT WAS GIVEN
7 WITH THE SAME PRODUCT AND IS CURRENTLY FOR MULTIPLE
8 MYELOMA WHERE THIS ONE IS FOCUSED ON SARCOMA.

9 SO THEN A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE PREVIOUS
10 FUNDING. SO AS I INDICATED, THAT OTHER PROJECT IN
11 OUR PORTFOLIO IS VERY SIMILAR. SO THAT ONE IS AN
12 ONGOING DISEASE TEAM PROJECT. ORIGINALLY RECEIVED
13 ABOUT 20 MILLION AND HAVE USED UP, THUS FAR, ABOUT
14 4.2.

15 THE PROJECT STARTED OUT ACTUALLY AS A
16 PROPOSAL THAT INCLUDED SOLID TUMOR SARCOMA
17 ORIGINALLY. IT WENT THROUGH SOME DELAYS IN TERMS OF
18 RECRUITMENT AND EVENTUALLY SWITCHED OVER TO MULTIPLE
19 MYELOMA FOR SEVERAL REASONS AS A POTENTIALLY BETTER
20 PATIENT POPULATION UNDER THAT AWARD. THERE ARE
21 STILL SOME DELAYS WITH IT THAT EXIST. SO CIRM IS
22 WORKING WITH THEM THROUGH THAT. AND SO THAT'S THE
23 PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING.

24 FROM THE REVIEWS, SO THE GWG REVIEWED THIS
25 APPLICATION. THEY GAVE IT A SCORE OF 1 WITH 14

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MEMBERS SCORING A 1 AND 1 MEMBER GIVING IT A SCORE
2 OF 2. CIRM TEAM OVERALL RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND
3 THE AWARD OF 4.7 MILLION.

4 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO.

5 DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO EITHER ACCEPT THE
6 TEAM RECOMMENDATION AND FUND THIS PROJECT OR TO NOT
7 ACCEPT THE TEAM RECOMMENDATION AND NOT FUND THIS
8 PROJECT?

9 MR. TORRES: AS A REVIEWER FOR THIS
10 PROJECT, I WHOLEHEARTEDLY ENDORSE AND MOVE IT TO BE
11 APPROVED.

12 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU, SENATOR TORRES.

13 DO WE HAVE A SECOND?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND.

15 MR. SHEEHY: SECONDED BY CHAIRMAN THOMAS.
16 DO WE HAVE BOARD DISCUSSION? QUESTIONS, COMMENTS?

17 DR. JUELSGAARD: I HAVE A COUPLE OF
18 QUESTIONS FOR DR. SAMBRANO.

19 I WANT TO GO BACK TO THE LAST SLIDE, THE
20 ONE THAT TALKS ABOUT THEIR EFFORTS TO DATE REGARDING
21 THE PREVIOUS INDICATION THAT THEY'RE PURSUING. YOU
22 MADE A COMMENT THAT THEY ORIGINALLY STARTED WITH
23 SARCOMA AND FOUND THAT DIFFICULT AND SWITCHED TO
24 MULTIPLE MYELOMA. WHAT MAKES ONE THINK THAT THINGS
25 HAVE CHANGED REGARDING SARCOMA? WHAT WAS THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DIFFICULTY, AND WHY IS IT NOT GOING TO BE A
2 DIFFICULTY THIS TIME?

3 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THAT'S A VERY GOOD
4 QUESTION. SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT DID COME UP
5 DURING REVIEW. AND SO THE RESPONSE THAT THEY
6 PROVIDED WAS THAT, AT LEAST TODAY COMPARED TO IN THE
7 PAST, THAT THEY HAVE DONE ADDITIONAL OUTREACH. THEY
8 HAD A PROGRAM -- THERE WAS INTEREST EXPRESSED BY
9 PATIENTS. AND SO THEY HAVE LINED UP A HANDFUL OF
10 PATIENTS THAT THEY FEEL CAN PARTICIPATE. AND
11 THEY'VE DOSED THEIR FIRST PATIENT. SO THEY FEEL
12 THAT THEY CAN OVERCOME THAT. AT LEAST FOR THE
13 GRANTS WORKING GROUP, IT WAS SUFFICIENT FOR THEM TO
14 BE OKAY WITH IT.

15 DR. JUELGAARD: THEN THE SECOND QUESTION.
16 ON THE SLIDE IN THE RIGHT-HAND COLUMN UNDER
17 MILESTONES, IT'S CALLED OM3. I'M NOT EXACTLY SURE
18 WHAT THE O STANDS FOR, BUT I IMAGINE THAT WAS A
19 MILESTONE 3.

20 IT TALKS ABOUT DELAY WITH SERIOUS
21 CONCERNS. CAN YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT SERIOUS
22 CONCERNS RELATES TO? SERIOUS CONCERNS TO ME ARE
23 SERIOUS, RIGHT. SO WHAT'S GOING ON?

24 DR. SAMBRANO: RIGHT. SO I CAN TELL YOU
25 IN GENERAL WHAT THE DELAYS WERE. SO THERE WERE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DELAYS RELATED TO ENROLLMENT, BUT ALSO DELAYS THAT
2 WERE RELATED TO ADVICE FROM A CDAP, THE CLINICAL
3 DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL, THAT WE HAD AT THE TIME
4 FOR THE DISEASE TEAM PROGRAMS WHERE THE APPLICANT
5 SUGGESTED THE CHANGE IN INDICATION TO MULTIPLE
6 MYELOMA. THAT WAS ACCEPTED. AND SO PART OF THE
7 DELAY WAS ALSO IN KIND OF REDIRECTING THE PROJECT TO
8 THAT NEW INDICATION. SO SOME OF THE DELAYS CAME
9 THERE.

10 AND TREATING THE FIRST SUBJECT DID NOT
11 HAPPEN FOR A WHILE, WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN A RESULT OF
12 THOSE THINGS. SO WE CAN CERTAINLY HAVE THE SCIENCE
13 OFFICER INVOLVED IN MANAGING THE PROJECT IF YOU WANT
14 MORE DETAIL THAN THAT TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE MORE OF
15 EXACTLY WHY THE SERIOUS CONCERN.

16 DR. JUELSGAARD: LET ME JUST MAKE TWO
17 OBSERVATIONS THAT I GUESS CONCERN ME. THE FIRST IS
18 JUST THE FACT THAT WHAT WE'VE GOT IS EXACTLY THE
19 SAME POTENTIAL THERAPEUTIC AGENT BEING TESTED NOW
20 CONCURRENTLY AT TWO DIFFERENT INDICATIONS. AND THE
21 QUESTION IS IS THAT A WISE USE OF MONEY? BECAUSE
22 THE ALTERNATIVE WOULD BE GET PROOF OF CONCEPT DATA
23 FROM THE FIRST THERAPEUTIC AREA THAT IS MULTIPLE
24 MYELOMA AND SEE IF IT SHOWS A POSITIVE EFFECT AND
25 THEN WITH THAT, AND THAT WOULD BE AT THE END OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PHASE 2, WITH THAT, THEY'D BE ABLE TO ADVANCE
2 FORWARD INTO OTHER INDICATIONS, INCLUDING SARCOMA.
3 MORE OF A STEPWISE APPROACH AS OPPOSED TO A
4 CONCURRENT APPROACH.

5 THE SECOND, AND THIS IS JUST A GENERAL
6 OBSERVATION OF THINGS THAT MAY HAPPEN AS WE'RE GOING
7 ALONG HERE, IT'S NOT, I THINK, LOST ON THE OUTSIDE
8 WORLD THAT WE ARE BECOMING INCREASINGLY SHORT ON
9 MONEY, AND AS OF YET THERE'S NO PROMISE THAT THERE
10 WILL BE ADDITIONAL FUNDS AVAILABLE AFTER WE EXPEND
11 WHAT WE HAVE.

12 ONE OF THE BEHAVIORS THAT THAT MIGHT DRIVE
13 IS FOR PEOPLE TO RUSH IN WITH PROJECTS HOPING TO GET
14 APPROVAL AND RECEIVE FUNDING BEFORE WE DO RUN OUT OF
15 FUNDS AND PEOPLE SORT OF GETTING THE CART BEFORE THE
16 HORSE; THAT IS, COMING IN WITH IDEAS FOR FUNDING
17 THAT REALLY WOULD BE BETTER OFF ON BEING HELD BACK
18 FOR A PERIOD OF TIME UNTIL MORE DATA IS DEVELOPED OR
19 UNTIL THEY SHOW MORE ABILITY TO KIND OF MOVE FORWARD
20 WITH THEIR CLINICAL EXPERIENCE, WHICH I FEAR IS
21 SOMEWHAT THE CASE HERE, NOT KNOWING A LOT MORE ABOUT
22 WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THEIR CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT
23 PLAN. RIGHT NOW IT'S NOT CONFIDENCE INSPIRING WHAT,
24 I'M HEARING ANYWAY, ABOUT HOW WELL THEY'RE ABLE TO
25 RUN A CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOSE ARE JUST OBSERVATIONS. I DON'T HAVE
2 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS.

3 DR. MARTIN: I HAVE A QUESTION JUST TO
4 MAKE CERTAIN I UNDERSTAND THIS. THAT IS THAT THE
5 TECHNOLOGY IN THE PREVIOUS NOW MM INDICATION AND
6 THIS ONE IS ESSENTIALLY IDENTICAL; AND, THAT IS, YOU
7 HAVE TO CHOOSE A DIFFERENT SOURCE OF THE STEM CELLS.
8 SO YOU HAVE SOME TYPE OF HAPLOIDENTICAL DONOR. BUT
9 THE TRANSDUCTION AND THE CONSTRUCT OF THE -- SO ONE
10 VECTOR IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME. IS THAT
11 UNDERSTANDING VALID?

12 DR. SAMBRANO: BOTH ARE THE SAME. IT'S
13 THE SAME THERAPEUTIC USING THE SAME T-CELL RECEPTOR
14 TARGETING THE NY-ESO-1. AND THEY'RE USING IT IN
15 EITHER CASE THE SAME WAY, EITHER TO TARGET MULTIPLE
16 MYELOMA OR SOLID TUMORS. THE ADMINISTRATION WOULD
17 BE THE ONLY THING THAT WOULD BE DIFFERENT, BUT
18 OTHERWISE IDENTICAL.

19 DR. TALIB: THIS IS SOHEL TALIB, THE
20 PROGRAM OFFICER. THIS IS AN AUTOLOGOUS APPROACH
21 WHICH PATIENT'S OWN BLOOD-FORMING STEM CELLS ARE
22 GENE MODIFIED, AND THEY BOTH TARGET ALL THE TUMOR
23 WHICH ARE NY-ESO-1 POSITIVE, AS IN THE CASE OF
24 CANCER AND IN THE CASE OF MULTIPLE MYELOMA, LIQUID
25 CANCER, SO THEY'RE TARGETING NY-ESO-POSITIVE TUMOR.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. MARTIN: IF THAT'S THE CASE, WHY NOT
2 SIMPLY BROADEN THE ENTRY CRITERIA TO INCLUDE MM'S OR
3 THE OTHER INDICATION, THE SARCOMA, IN THE SAME
4 TRIAL? BECAUSE THE ONLY DIFFERENCE IS WHAT THE
5 MALIGNANT DISEASE IS THAT THE DONOR, AUTOLOGOUS
6 DONOR, PATIENT EXHIBITS. SO, THEREFORE, THE FUNDING
7 WOULD BE THE SAME EXCEPT YOU JUST HAVE TO FILE AN
8 ADDENDUM TO THE IND, I WOULD EXPECT.

9 DR. TALIB: THESE ARE TWO SEPARATE IND'S.
10 SO THE INVESTIGATOR INDEED HAS TWO IND'S, ONE FOR
11 MULTIPLE MYELOMA AND THE SECOND ONE, THE ONE WHICH
12 IS BEING PROPOSED HERE FOR SARCOMA, THAT IS SEPARATE
13 IND. SO THESE ARE TWO SEPARATE IND'S AND INDICATION
14 ARE NY-ESO-POSITIVE TUMORS.

15 DR. MARTIN: HAVE YOU EXPLORED COMBINING
16 THAT INTO A SINGLE IND BY AMENDING ONE OR THE OTHER?

17 DR. TALIB: I'M AFRAID I CANNOT ANSWER THE
18 QUESTION, BUT THE PI FOR THIS CLINICAL TRIAL IS HERE
19 IN THIS MEETING. PERHAPS IF YOU NEED MORE
20 INFORMATION FROM THE INVESTIGATOR, HE'S HERE.

21 DR. NOWICKI: I'M DR. NOWICKI. I'M THE
22 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR FOR CIRM GRANT CLIN2-11380.
23 IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION ABOUT COMBINING THE TWO
24 IND'S, ACTUALLY THE FDA WILL NOT ALLOW US BECAUSE
25 IT'S DIFFERENT DIVISIONS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. SHEEHY: DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR
2 QUESTION, DR. MARTIN?

3 DR. MARTIN: YES, IT DOES, UNFORTUNATELY.
4 I DON'T UNDERSTAND. I UNDERSTAND THE ISSUE OF
5 DIFFERENT DIVISIONS. I'VE HAD EXPERIENCE TRYING TO
6 DO THIS, AND IT'S A NEGOTIATION WITH THE AGENCY.
7 IT'S SIMILAR, BUT OBVIOUSLY NOT IDENTICAL.

8 MR. SHEEHY: SINCE WE HAVE DR. NOWICKI, DO
9 WE HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT? MR.
10 JUELSGAARD, IF YOU MIGHT WANT TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS
11 OR YOU HAD SOME CONCERNS OR ANYBODY ELSE ON THE
12 BOARD.

13 DR. JUELSGAARD: GIVEN THAT WE HAVE A
14 REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE INSTITUTION THAT'S
15 CONDUCTING THE TRIAL, SO GO BACK TO MY QUESTION ONE.
16 WHY ARE YOU -- WHAT WAS THE DECISION PROCESS IN
17 DECIDING TO CONCURRENTLY PURSUE SARCOMA AND MULTIPLE
18 MYELOMA? WHY NOT JUST WAIT TO SEE WHAT YOUR PHASE 2
19 RESULTS ARE ON MULTIPLE MYELOMA, SEE IF YOU HAVE
20 PROOF OF CONCEPT, AND THEN MAKE A DECISION ABOUT
21 WHETHER TO PROCEED WITH SARCOMA OR NOT? WHY PROCEED
22 WITH BOTH AT THIS POINT?

23 DR. NOWICKI: SO INITIALLY WE DID HAVE THE
24 INDICATION FOR SARCOMA AND OTHER SOLID TUMORS. THAT
25 WAS THE INITIAL APPROACH. WHAT HAD HAPPENED WAS WE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WERE THEN MADE TO CHANGE THE INDICATION BY CIRM. WE
2 WERE MADE TO CHANGE THE INDICATION FROM SOLID TUMOR
3 SARCOMA TO MULTIPLE MYELOMA. AND, HOWEVER, AT THE
4 TIME THAT THAT WAS HAPPENING, WE ALREADY RECRUITED
5 THE FIRST PATIENT FOR SARCOMA AND WE WERE ABLE TO
6 ADMINISTER THE TREATMENT SUCCESSFULLY. THERE WERE
7 NO TOXICITIES. IT WAS ADMINISTERED VERY SAFELY, AND
8 IT WAS A VERY SMOOTH PROCEDURE.

9 AND THE THING IS THAT BECAUSE WE HAD PUT
10 FORTH SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF OUTREACH INTO THE
11 SARCOMA POPULATION AND ALSO INTO OUR NETWORK OF
12 CLINICIANS, UCLA BEING THE THIRD LARGEST SARCOMA
13 CENTER IN THE COUNTRY AND THE LARGEST CENTER ON THE
14 WEST COAST, WE WERE ABLE TO ACTUALLY BEGIN TO GET
15 PATIENT INTEREST THAT WAS EXPRESSED TO US AND
16 REFERRED TO US. AND FOR A WHILE, WE WERE CONTINUING
17 TO SCREEN SUCH PATIENTS BECAUSE WE WERE UNCLEAR SORT
18 OF WHERE THE DECISION WOULD FALL OUT FROM THAT. AND
19 WE ACTUALLY WOUND UP HAVING TO TURN A NUMBER OF
20 SARCOMA PATIENTS AWAY. ONCE THE INDICATION HAD BEEN
21 CHANGED TO MYELOMA, WE NO LONGER HAD THE FUNDING FOR
22 SARCOMA.

23 AND WE HAVE ACTUALLY EVEN GOT FURTHER
24 CONTINUED. THOSE OUTREACH PROGRAMS HAVE RECENTLY
25 BEEN MADE A REFERRAL CENTER FOR NY-ESO-1 POSITIVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SARCOMAS BY THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE SURGERY
2 BRANCH. WE'D BEEN CONDUCTING THESE TRIALS AND NOW
3 NO LONGER HAVE THE BANDWIDTH TO TREAT MANY PATIENTS.
4 SO THEY WANT TO REFER ALL OF THEIR WEST COAST
5 PATIENTS TO US NOW.

6 AND SO GIVEN THAT WE HAVE A SIGNIFICANT
7 NUMBER OF PATIENTS THAT ARE COMING THROUGH THAT HAVE
8 SUCH INTEREST IN THESE THERAPIES, WE'RE VERY KEEN TO
9 CONTINUE THIS PROTOCOL AND TO SECURE FUNDING TO DO
10 SO. AND WE'VE BEEN VERY FORTUNATE TO HAVE BEEN
11 FUNDED BY CIRM IN THE PAST TO DO SO, AND THE PATIENT
12 THAT WAS TREATED BEFORE CERTAINLY APPRECIATES THAT
13 AND WE KNOW OUR FUTURE PATIENTS WOULD APPRECIATE IT
14 AS WELL.

15 MR. SHEEHY: DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR
16 QUESTIONS?

17 DR. JUELSGAARD: WITH ONE ADDITION. ARE
18 YOU NOW TREATING -- THESE SARCOMA PATIENTS THAT YOU
19 WOULD BE TREATING, ARE THOSE WHO HAVE HAD BOTH
20 SURGERY AND CHEMOTHERAPY WITHOUT SUCCESS? BASICALLY
21 THEIR CANCER REMAINS OR IS ADVANCING IN THE FACE OF
22 BOTH SURGERY AND CHEMOTHERAPY? IS THAT THE COHORT
23 YOU WOULD BE RECRUITING?

24 DR. NOWICKI: CORRECT.

25 DR. JUELSGAARD: WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SARCOMA POPULATION YOU WOULD BE SEEING WOULD
2 NORMALLY FIT THAT CATEGORY OF FAILING BOTH
3 THERAPIES?

4 DR. NOWICKI: JUST TO CLARIFY. BASICALLY
5 WE CONSIDER METASTATIC DISEASE AS WELL AS
6 CONSIDERING THAT WELL OVER HALF OF THESE PATIENTS
7 ULTIMATELY GO ON TO DEVELOP METASTASIS. IT'S
8 UNFORTUNATELY A VERY COMMON OCCURRENCE WITH THE
9 SARCOMA POPULATION. AND THE ONES THAT HAVE MORE
10 LOCALLY PROGRESSIVE DISEASE, LIKE A STAGE 3C, MIGHT
11 HAVE FAILED SURGERY, HAVE FAILED CHEMOTHERAPY, OR
12 OTHERWISE HAVE INOPERABLE DISEASE BECAUSE OF THE
13 LOCATION. ONE OF THE WORST THINGS AS I TREAT
14 SARCOMA, AND ONE OF THE WORST PARTS OF MY JOB IS
15 BEING ABLE TO TELL THESE PATIENTS THAT THERE'S
16 NOTHING MORE I CAN DO, THERE'S NOTHING MORE THAT I
17 CAN TRY. AND THIS IMMUNOTHERAPY APPROACH WITH A
18 STEM-CELL BASED APPROACH IS REALLY THE ONE OF A KIND
19 THAT HAS THE ABILITY TO REALLY OFFER SOME HOPE TO
20 THESE PATIENTS. SO ABSOLUTELY, UNFORTUNATELY, A
21 VERY COMMON OCCURRENCE, I CAN TELL YOU.

22 DR. JUELSGAARD: ONE MORE QUICK QUESTION.
23 SO THEN YOU HAVE THE CONFIDENCE THAT YOU HAVE THE
24 PATIENT POPULATION OR YOU CAN RECRUIT THE PATIENT
25 POPULATION NECESSARY TO PROCEED WITH THIS TRIAL IN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SARCOMA WITHOUT UNDUE DELAY?

2 DR. NOWICKI: I BELIEVE SO.

3 DR. JUELSGAARD: YOU FEEL CONFIDENT IN
4 THAT?

5 DR. NOWICKI: I DO. AS I SAID, WE'VE HAD
6 PATIENTS ACTIVELY AWAITING POTENTIAL ENROLLMENT IN
7 THIS TRIAL THAT HAVE STILL EXPRESSED INTEREST FROM
8 BEFORE WE HAD THE FUNDING SHUNTED TO MYELOMA. WE
9 ALSO HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE UCLA/UCI ALPHA STEM
10 CELL CLINIC, WHICH HAS THE ABILITY TO ACCESS THE
11 RECORDS OF 12 MILLION PATIENTS RESPECTIVE PATIENT
12 IDENTIFICATION FURTHERMORE. AND AS I SAID BEFORE,
13 UCLA IS THE THIRD LARGEST SARCOMA CENTER AND THE
14 LARGEST ON THE WEST COAST. SO I DEFINITELY AM
15 CONFIDENT IN OUR VOLUME.

16 DR. JUELSGAARD: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

17 DR. NOWICKI: THANK YOU.

18 MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS
19 FOR THE APPLICANT?

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'VE GOT ONE QUESTION.
21 IN THE DOCUMENTATION IT REFERS TO THE FACT THAT THIS
22 COULD BE USED FOR OTHER TYPES OF SOLID TUMORS WITH
23 HIGH NY-ESO-1 EXPRESSION BESIDES SARCOMA. COULD YOU
24 ELABORATE ON THAT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE BOARD
25 PLEASE?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. NOWICKI: ABSOLUTELY. THANK YOU. I'M
2 GLAD YOU ASKED THAT QUESTION. WE TALK ABOUT
3 SARCOMAS BECAUSE THESE ARE THE MOST FREQUENT TUMOR
4 TYPES TO EXPRESS NY-ESO-1 SYNOVIAL SARCOMA AT A RATE
5 OF GREATER THAN 80 PERCENT; BUT A MINORITY OF
6 MELANOMAS, WHICH WE KNOW ARE CERTAINLY COMMON,
7 EXPRESS NY-ESO ON THE ORDER OF ABOUT 30 PERCENT. AS
8 I MENTIONED BEFORE, I'M A PEDIATRIC ONCOLOGIST. AND
9 NEUROBLASTOMAS, WHEN THEY RECUR AND ARE METASTATIC,
10 CAN EXPRESS NY-ESO ON THE ORDER OF ABOUT 30 PERCENT
11 AS WELL. AND WE'VE ALSO SCREENED IT IN A NUMBER OF
12 OTHER SOLID TUMORS. SO THAT'S WHY THE INDICATION
13 IS, BROADLY SPEAKING, FOR SARCOMAS, BUT THE ACTUAL
14 IND IS FOR ANY SOLID TUMOR. SO WE'RE ABLE TO CATCH
15 A LOT OF OTHER MISCELLANEOUS TUMOR TYPES AS WELL.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

17 MR. SHEEHY: ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR
18 COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT?
19 THANK YOU. THEN COULD WE CALL THE ROLL PLEASE.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

21 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

23 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

25 DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
2 DR. MARTIN: NO.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER.
4 MS. MILLER: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
6 DR. PADILLA: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
8 MR. PANETTA: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
10 DR. PRIETO: AYE.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
12 DR. QUINT: NO.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
14 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
16 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
18 DR. STEWARD: YES, AS LONG AS I'M NOT IN
19 CONFLICT. THE PI JUST MENTIONED THE UCLA/UCI ALPHA
20 CLINIC. AND I DON'T RECALL SEEING THAT AS PART OF
21 THE BUDGET. BUT AS LONG AS I'M NOT IN CONFLICT,
22 YES.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. TORRES: AYE.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.

3 MS. WINOKUR: YES.

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.

5 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU. SO THAT CONCLUDES
6 THE BUSINESS OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.
7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
9 MR. SHEEHY.

10 DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT AT ANY OF
11 THE SITES ON ANY TOPIC THAT ANYBODY WISHES TO
12 DISCUSS?

13 DR. NOWICKI: YES. I'M STILL HERE AT THE
14 TABLE. THIS IS DR. NOWICKI. I JUST WANT TO THANK
15 CIRM AND EVERYONE HERE ON BEHALF OF UCLA AND ON
16 BEHALF OF OUR PATIENTS. THANK YOU.

17 DR. CHIU: ARLENE CHIU FROM THE CITY OF
18 HOPE. I HAVE A QUICK QUESTION ABOUT THE SICKLE CELL
19 INITIATIVE. IS THE INITIATIVE POSTED ANYWHERE THAT
20 WE CAN SEE WHAT ARE THE CONDITIONS? THAT'S THE
21 FIRST QUESTION.

22 AND THE SECOND QUESTION IS, HAVING SEEN
23 THE RANGE OF SICKLE CELL FUNDING THAT CIRM HAS GIVEN
24 OUT, WILL NHLBI BE HELPING OUT IN ANY OF THE OTHER
25 CLINICAL TRIALS THAT ARE POSTED?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. MILLAN: ARLENE, IT'S MARIA. I'M
2 GOING TO HAVE GABE THOMPSON SUMMARIZE THE CONDITIONS
3 OF THE MOU WITH THE NHLBI.

4 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU. IS THERE ALSO
5 ANYTHING ON THE WEBSITE THAT I COULD REFER BACK TO
6 IN CASE PEOPLE ARE INTERESTED OR NOT YET?

7 MR. THOMPSON: SO THE SICKLE CELL
8 INITIATIVE IS ACTUALLY ON THE CIRM SITE. IT'S JUST
9 GOING TO JUST COME THROUGH OUR REGULAR CLIN PROGRAM
10 ANNOUNCEMENT, THE CLIN1, THE CLIN2, OR THE CLIN3.

11 THERE IS A UNIQUE APPLICATION THAT IS
12 BUILT FOR THE INITIATIVE, AND I WILL SHARE WITH YOU
13 THE LINK TO THE APPLICATION. BUT THEY WILL FOLLOW
14 THE SAME PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT. SO THAT'S ALREADY
15 POSTED.

16 DR. CHIU: THANK YOU.

17 MR. THOMPSON: TO ANSWER YOUR SECOND
18 QUESTION, THE EXISTING AWARDS IN SICKLE CELL
19 WOULDN'T NECESSARILY BE PART OF THIS INITIATIVE.
20 ONLY NEW PROJECTS THAT COME IN FOR FUNDING.

21 DR. CHIU: GOT IT. THANK YOU.

22 MR. TORRES: YOU ALSO MAY KNOW THAT
23 ASSEMBLY MEMBER MIKE GIPSON HAS A SICKLE CELL
24 INITIATIVE FOR 15 MILLION IN THE LEGISLATURE, AND
25 WE'RE MONITORING THAT LEGISLATION AS IT MOVES FROM

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ASSEMBLY AND HOPEFULLY TO THE SENATE.

2 DR. CHIU: THAT'S VERY EXCITING. THANK
3 YOU VERY MUCH.

4 MR. TORRES: THAT'S AB1105.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS?
6 HEARING NONE, THAT CONCLUDES TODAY'S AGENDA. I
7 WOULD LIKE TO NOTE FOR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD USUALLY
8 OUR NEXT IN-PERSON MEETING WOULD BE IN JUNE.
9 HOWEVER, THIS YEAR, FOR SCHEDULING REASONS, THE NEXT
10 IN-PERSON MEETING IS MAY 23D. WOULD ENCOURAGE
11 EVERYBODY TO ATTEND IF AT ALL POSSIBLE. AND WITH
12 THAT, THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR YOUR ATTENDANCE AND
13 PARTICIPATION. AND WE STAND ADJOURNED.

14 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 1 P.M.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON APRIL 29, 2019, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152
133 HENNA COURT
SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864
208-255-5453